## REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claim 22 has been amended as shown at page 6 of the Reply.

In view of the comments and amendments herein, it is believed that the present application is in condition for allowance. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

## I. Objection to Claim 22

Claim 22 is objected to because of minor informalities. Claim 22 has been amended as suggested by the Examiner in the Office Action dates November 4, 2009. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

## II. Rejection of Claims 1-22 Under 35 U.S.C §112

Claims 1-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reason. The claims are supported by the specification to enable one skilled in the art to make and/or use the claimed invention.

> *Any analysis of whether a particular claim is supported by the disclosure in an application requires a determination of* ***whether that disclosure, when filed, contained sufficient information regarding the subject matter of the claims as to enable one skilled in the pertinent art to make and use the claimed invention ...*** *A patent need not teach, and preferably omits, what is well known in the art.* In re Buchner, 929 F.2d 660, 661, 18 USPQ2d 1331, 1332 (Fed. Cir. 1991); Hybritech, Inc. v. Monoclonal Antibodies, Inc., 802 F.2d 1367, 1384, 231 USPQ 81, 94 (Fed. Cir. 1986), cert. denied, 480 U.S. 947 (1987); and Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GMBH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co., 730 F.2d 1452, 1463, 221 USPQ 481, 489 (Fed. Cir. 1984). (*See* MPEP §2164.01) (emphasis added)

The Office Action asserts that the specification fails to support the bolded limitation of independent claim 1(similarly recited in independent claims 11, 21, and 22) shown here:

*A network node comprising: a transmitter; a receiver; and a controller configured to automatically and repeatedly cause the network node to cycle back and forth between transmitting information on a network with the transmitter and receiving information with the receiver from the network in accordance with a pre-determined pattern, wherein the pre-determined pattern is associated with the network node and a plurality of other nodes, the pre-determined pattern defines a cycle with one or more specified transmission portions and one or more specified receiving portions for each node from the group comprising the network node and the plurality of other nodes,* ***wherein the pre-determined pattern further includes within the cycle at least a partial overlap between a transmission portion and a receiving portion of each combination of two nodes from the group comprising the network node and the plurality of other nodes***.

The specification at paragraph [0092] clearly supports the bolded feature of the subject claim. In particular paragraph [0092] states:

[0092] To facilitate synchronization, the length of each cycle may track a pre-determined pattern of lengths that each node in the network identically follows. **Each node in the network may further be configured to be at a particular point in the pre-determined pattern that is different at any one moment in time from the point in the pattern at which every other node is at**. By following this approach, there may **always be a particular point in time when a scheduled transmission of a transmitting node will coincide with the scheduled reception of a target node with which the transmitting node wishes to communicate over a primary link**. (emphasis added)

It is clear from this paragraph, for example, that transmission and reception of each combination of two nodes overlaps in the pattern. Furthermore, paragraph [0095] states:

[0095] At some point during the pattern of cycles, the initiation of a transmission by the network node will be at a time when the second node is receiving. An example of this is shown in FIG. 6 at the point in time **605**. **At this point in time, the second node is in the receiving portion of its cycle $C_{82}$, while the network node is just beginning to transmit in its cycle $C_{13}$. If the length of the information that needs to be transmitted from the network node will not exceed the duration of the remaining portion of the receive cycle $C_{82}$, the point in time 605 then becomes a point in time when the network node knows that it can transmit its information to the second node with confidence that the second node will receive all of it**.

This paragraph, for example, clearly supports at least a partial overlap of a transmission portion and a receiving portion of a pair of nodes. Therefore, the specification clearly describes the subject matter of the claims in a way that enables one skilled in the art to which it pertains to make and/or use the invention. As such, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

## CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [QUALP839US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

TUROCY & WATSON, LLP

/Nilesh S. Amin/
Nilesh S. Amin
Reg. No. 58,407

TUROCY & WATSON, LLP
127 Public Square
57th Floor – Key Tower
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731